

requesting a data request from at least one accessor over a network by at least one accessee using a NCD software on at least one accessee NCD;

invoking client software on the at least one accessor computer in response to the accessee's request for an accessor's offer, and wherein invoking the client software further comprises:

connecting the at least one accessee computer to the at least one information server;

invoking the information server software;

forwarding the accessor's offer to the least one information server; and

gathering the purchasing information by the information server to complete a purchasing transaction.

REMARKS

Claims 1-128 remain in the application. Claim 111 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 2, and 6-128 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Rowney et al. To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim, as stated in §2131 of the M.P.E.P.:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).